

May 20, 1983

LB 120

PRESIDENT: If no objections, so ordered.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator DeCamp had a second amendment, he also wishes to withdraw that.

PRESIDENT: Without objection, so ordered.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Warner would move to return the bill for a specific amendment.

PRESIDENT: Chair recognizes Senator Warner and asks for order in the Chamber so we can hear what is going on. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to take everything out of the bill that was amended into it, except as it was originally introduced. It originally was introduced to clarify because of a court case language that was. . . as to what signs were not permitted along the interstate. Because of a series of Attorney General's opinions that have raised questions on the use of the logo and the other proposals that have been put onto the bill, I think several people at least have agreed so that the state is not jeopardized in its federal funds by being out of compliance, that the bill should be cleared up and advanced as it was introduced and then the other issue can be addressed over the summer as to the use of logos or there is a motion filed, I filed on 297 to permit it there too, but in any event so there is no problem of constitutional issues in the bill, this takes out all of the questionable material and leaves the bill as it was introduced. Move the bill be returned for the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Higgins. (GAVEL). . . Please, Senator Higgins.

SENATOR HIGGINS: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Warner, could I ask you a question please? I don't think anyone was paying attention when Senator Warner was discussing this amendment, LB 120, so I. . . (will you two go fight someplace else). Senator Warner, as I tried to understand your amendment, what it does, it takes LB 120, all the amendments that have been adopted, it is throwing all those out, putting the bill back into its original form, which was what?

SENATOR WARNER: Its original form merely defined what a visible sign was or is from the interstate and the reason that the bill was introduced because of a court decision sometime back that throughout our current law because it was vague, as I recall, and this is to address that issue and the necessity